

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/300,482	04/28/99	CHEIKH	N 04983.0031.U

022930 HM22/0920
HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE LLP
BOX 34
1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

EXAMINER	
ZEMAN, M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1631	6
DATE MAILED:	
09/20/00	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/300,482	CHEIKH ET AL.
	Examiner Mary K Zeman	Art Unit 1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims 1-9 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
 1. received.
 2. received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
 3. received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-2, drawn to polynucleotides from an expressed sequence tag library for use in detecting altered expression, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
- II. Claims 3-4, drawn to a purified polypeptide encoded by a polynucleotide from an EST library, classified in class 530, subclass 300.
- III. Claim 5, drawn to an antibody to a polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 388.1.
- IV. Claims 6-7, drawn a transgenic plant, classified in class 435, subclass 410.
- V. Claims 8-9, drawn to polynucleotide-based methods of hybridization screening, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are separate and distinct because the inventions are directed to different chemical types regarding the critical limitations therein. For Group II, the critical feature is a polypeptide whereas for Group I the critical feature is a polynucleotide. It is acknowledged that various processing steps may cause a polypeptide of group II to be directed as to its synthesis by a polynucleotide of Group I, however, the completely separate chemical types of the inventions of Groups I and II supports the undue search burden if both were examined together. Additionally, polypeptides have been most commonly, albeit not always, separately characterized and published in the Biochemical literature, thus significantly adding to the search burden if examiner together, as compared to being searched separately. Also, it is pointed out

Art Unit: 1631

that processing that may connect two groups does not prevent them from being viewed as distinct, because enough processing can result in producing any composition from any other composition if the processing is not so limited to additions, subtractions, enzyme actions, etc.

Inventions I and III are separate and distinct, as the claims of Invention I are drawn to polynucleotides, while the claim of group III is drawn to an antibody. These are differing biochemical entities having differing biochemical properties, structures and effects. Invention III would require searching in areas unrelated to polynucleotides, and as such, would require an undue burden on the examiner if not restricted.

Inventions I and IV are separate and distinct as the polynucleotides of Invention I are a separate composition of matter, a plant and a polynucleotide. While the polynucleotide may be used to transform the transgenic plant of Invention IV, the polynucleotides also have other uses in hybridization assays, PCR, and Southern Blotting. The two Inventions would require searching separate and non-overlapping areas which would constitute an undue search burden on the examiner if not restricted.

Inventions I and V are separate and distinct, as the polynucleotides of Invention I are to be used in hybridization assays and require differing characteristics from polynucleotides to be used in polynucleotide based screening assays. These differing methods have differing steps and differing intents. The two Inventions would require searching separate and non-overlapping areas which would constitute an undue search burden on the examiner if not restricted.

Inventions II and III are separate and distinct as the polypeptides of Invention II are structurally and biochemically different than the antibodies of Invention III. While the antibodies may bind to the polypeptides of Invention II, the biochemical activities of each

Art Unit: 1631

Invention are quite different, requiring differing methods and areas of search, which would impose an undue burden upon the examiner.

Inventions II and IV are separate and distinct as they are drawn to differing compositions of matter, Invention II is drawn to isolated polypeptides/ enzymes, and Invention IV is drawn to transformed multicellular organisms. As such, the two inventions would require searching in substantially non-overlapping art areas and would pose an undue search burden upon the examiner if not restricted.

Inventions II and V are separate and distinct as the polypeptides of Invention II are not used in the methods of Invention V. As such the Inventions would require search in separate and non-overlapping areas, imposing an undue search burden upon the examiner if not restricted.

Inventions III and IV are separate and distinct as the antibodies of Invention III are a differing composition of matter than the transformed plants of Invention IV. As such the Inventions would require search in separate and non-overlapping areas, imposing an undue search burden upon the examiner if not restricted.

Inventions III and V are separate and distinct, as the antibodies of Invention III are not used in the methods of Invention V. As such the Inventions would require search in separate and non-overlapping areas, imposing an undue search burden upon the examiner if not restricted.

Inventions IV and V are separate and distinct as the transformed plants cannot be used in the methods of Invention V. As such the Inventions would require search in separate and non-overlapping areas, imposing an undue search burden upon the examiner if not restricted.

Sequence Election Requirement Applicable to All Groups

In addition, each Group detailed above reads on patentably distinct Groups drawn to multiple SEQ ID Numbers. The sequences are patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences, and a further restriction is applied to each Group. For an elected Group drawn to amino acid sequences, the Applicants must further elect a single amino acid sequence. For an elected Group drawn to nucleotide sequences, the Applicants are permitted to elect up to 10 nucleic acid sequences (See MPEP 803.04).

MPEP 803.04 states:

Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. Nevertheless, to further aid the biotechnology industry in protecting its intellectual property without creating an undue burden on the Office, the Commissioner has decided sua sponte to partially waive the requirements of 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. and permit a reasonable number of such nucleotide sequences to be claimed in a single application. See Examination of Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequences, 1192 O.G. 68 (November 19, 1996).

It has been determined that normally ten sequences constitute a reasonable number for examination purposes. Accordingly, in most cases, up to ten independent and distinct nucleotide sequences will be examined in a single application without restriction. In addition to the specifically selected sequences, those sequences which are patentably indistinct from the selected sequences will also be examined. Furthermore, nucleotide sequences encoding the same protein are not considered to be independent and distinct inventions and will continue to be examined together.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

A fully responsive communication will contain both a proper election of a group, and a further sequence election, as required.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary K Zeman whose telephone number is (703) 305-7133. The examiner can be reached between the hours of 7:30 am and 5:00 pm Monday through Thursday, and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached at (703) 308 4028.

The fax number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-7401.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

mkz
September 18, 2000

Examiner, 1631
Mary K Zeman